

REMARKS

This is intended as a supplemental response to the Office Action dated June 23, 2010, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on September 23, 2010. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-2, 4-13 and 15-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 12-13 and 15-20 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 12 and 17 have been amended. Claims 9-11 have been canceled.

Further, Applicants are not conceding in this application that those amended (or cancelled) claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these (pre-amended or cancelled claims) and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Statement of Substance of Interview

On November 23, 2010 and interview was held between Gero G. McClellan (attorney for Applicants) and Examiner Betit. The parties discussed claim 1 and the *Cragun* reference. During the interview, the parties identified some claim amendments that may be helpful in moving prosecution forward. Those amendments are reflected in this response. And, while no agreement was reached during the interview, the Examiner agreed to reconsider the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Cragun et al.* (U.S. Publication 2005/0125447, hereinafter, “*Cragun*”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Cragun* does not disclose "each and every element as set forth in the claim". For example, *Cragun* does not disclose: generating a linking value identifying the portion of the set of data associated with the retrieved one or more annotation records, the retrieved one or more annotation records including at least two annotation fields, each annotation field containing a separate annotation; consolidating data contained in the at least two annotation fields of the retrieved one or more annotation records; and returning an annotation data structure comprising a field containing the linking value and a field containing the consolidated data. In particular, the reference does not teach consolidating annotation data from at least two respective annotation fields and placing that consolidated data into a single field of an annotation data structure that also includes a field containing a linking value.

Independent claim 12 recites similar limitations as claim 1. Therefore, the claims 1 and 12, and the claims dependent thereon, are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. MCCLELLAN, Reg. #44227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (336) 698-4286
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)